

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

CASE NO. 3:10-MD-02143 RS

MDL NO. 2143

IN RE OPTICAL DISK DRIVE
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

~~PROPOSED~~ **REVISED OMNIBUS ORDER
GRANTING JOINT ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION OF CERTAIN PARTIES AND
NON-PARTIES TO FILE UNDER SEAL
CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS FILED IN
CONNECTION WITH CLASS
CERTIFICATION BRIEFS**

This document relates to:

ALL DIRECT PURCHASER AND
INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

This matter comes before the Court on the Joint Administrative Motion of Certain Parties and Non-Parties to File Under Seal Confidential Materials Filed in Connection with Class Certification Briefs (“Joint Motion to Seal”). (Dkt. 1222.) The Joint Motion to Seal was filed by Defendants, certain Direct Action Plaintiffs and various non-parties in accordance with the Stipulation and Order Regarding Administrative Motions to Seal Materials Filed With Class Certification Briefs (Dkt. 1021). The [Proposed] Omnibus Sealing Order submitted with the Joint Motion to Seal encompassed the proposed sealing requests related to each of the administrative motions to seal filed in connection with the Direct and Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Motions for Class Certification. (See Dkts. 877, 881, 895, 922, 1222.)

As set forth in the Order Denying Motions for Class Certification, the Court finds that the Defendants, Direct Action Plaintiffs and non-parties have “made the minimal redactions necessary to protect qualifying confidential information.” (Dkt. 1444 n.11.) Accordingly, the Joint Motion to Seal is hereby GRANTED and the materials identified in Attachment A to this Order shall be sealed.¹ To the extent any party believes that revised redactions may be necessary for the public version of any document referenced in Attachment A that it previously filed, it may re-file such document with the sealed portions redacted consistent with this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 4/15/15



Hon. Richard Seeborg
United States District Judge

¹ Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs and Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs have indicated that they have no objections as to the form of this Order, but have asked that their signatures be removed because they continue to object to the substance of the Court’s prior ruling.

1 Approved as to form:

2 DATED: April 6, 2015

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

3 /s/ Belinda S Lee

4 BELINDA S LEE

5 Belinda S Lee (SBN 199635)
6 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
7 San Francisco, CA 94111
8 Telephone: (415) 395-8240
9 Facsimile: (415) 395-8095
10 belinda.lee@lw.com

11 Attorneys for Defendant Toshiba Samsung Storage
12 Technology Korea Corporation, and Liaison
13 Counsel for Defendants

14 DATED: April 6, 2015

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

15 By /s/ Rodney J. Ganske
16 RODNEY J. GANSKE

17 Rodney J. Ganske (SBN 283819)
18 Michael P. Kenny
19 Debra D. Bernstein
20 Andrew J. Tuck
21 1201 W. Peachtree Street NW
22 Atlanta, Georgia 30309
23 Telephone: (404) 881-7000
24 Facsimile: (404) 881-7777
25 rod.ganske@alston.com
26 mike.kenny@alston.com
27 debra.bernstein@alston.com
28 andy.tuck@alston.com

KERR & WAGSTAFFE LLP
James M. Wagstaffe (SBN 95535)
100 Spear Street, 18th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-1576
Telephone: (415) 371-8500
Facsimile: (415) 371-0500
wagstaffe@kerrwagstaffe.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs Dell Inc. and Dell Products
L.P., and Liaison Counsel for Direct Action
Plaintiffs

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), the filer attests that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the signatories.